### 1NC- Warming (2:25)

**Academia is suppressing climate denial now—spills over to government—plan reverses that.**

**Williamson 16**  
KEVIN D. WILLIAMSON, roving correspondent for National Review, April 3, 2016 4:00 AM, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/433582/free-speech-climate-science-campus-censorship-only-beginning> ~Premier~

In March of 2014, Professor Lawrence Torcello of the Rochester Institute of Technology, the seal of which appears alongside the definition of “second-rate” in many dictionaries, published a short article online calling for the criminalization of what he calls “climate denial,” meaning the holding, perpetuating, and, especially, the financial support of heretical ideas about global warming. A few articles were written criticizing the article, and the response was the expected one: “It’s just one crank nobody professor from some second-rate philosophy department publishing a blog post, don’t make such a big deal about it!” Professor Torcello subsequently denied that he had argued what he plainly does argue, namely that legal protections for free speech should not encircle those who dissent from the received dogma of global warming. “Misguided concern regarding free speech,” he wrote, should be no impediment to imposing criminal sanctions on those whose activism “remains a serious deterrent against meaningful political action” on the issue. We’ve taken this ride before: An obscure academic writes something loony. We withstood “feminist physics” and “queer algebra,” and we’ll get through this, too. Unless we don’t. RELATED: Democrats Push to Criminalize Dissent Shortly after Professor Torcello’s tentative exploration of criminalizing political disagreement, Gawker published an article by Adam Weinstein bearing the straightforward headline: “Arrest climate-change deniers.” Building on Professor Torcello’s argument, Weinstein called explicitly for the imprisonment (“denialists should face jail”) of those working to further particular political goals (“quietist agenda posturing as skepticism”) on climate change. Never mind that protecting people and institutions attempting to further a political agenda is precisely the reason we have a First Amendment. Weinstein dismisses the First Amendment out of hand, with the expected dread cliché: “First Amendment rights have never been absolute. You still can’t yell ‘fire’ in a crowded theater. You shouldn’t be able to yell ‘balderdash’ at 10,883 scientific journal articles a year, all saying the same thing.” Yelling ‘balderdash’ at the conventional wisdom has a very long and proud tradition. Yelling “balderdash” at the conventional wisdom has a very long and proud tradition. (Not that it should matter to this debate, but I suppose I should here note for the record that I hold more or less conventional views on climate change as a phenomenon but prefer mitigatory policies to preventative ones.) The name “Elsevier” is not beloved on college campuses (the modern company is a publisher of academic journals and sometimes is criticized for its pricing), but it is to that company’s spiritual ancestor, the Dutch printing house of Lodewijk Elzevir and his descendants, that we owe the publication of, among other articles of samizdat, the works of Galileo, at that time under Inquisitorial interdict. (The story of Elzevir’s 1636 covert mission to Arcetri to meet with Galileo and smuggle his manuscripts to Amsterdam, a city that was then as now a byword for liberality, would make a pretty good movie.) It isn’t that it’s likely that our contemporary global-warming critics are doing work as important as Galileo’s: It’s that no one knows or can predict, which is the practical case for free expression, which should be of some concern even to our modern progressives, self-styled empiricists and pragmatists who reject the moral case for free expression. I raised some alarm about the Gawker article at National Review, and once again the response was the predictable one: “It’s just Gawker, and it influences no one possessing any intelligence. No sensible person takes Adam Weinstein seriously.” That is all true enough, but it is not only or mainly the intelligent and the sensible who move the world of public policy. We have Kennedys to consider. RELATED: Students Learn What Teachers Teach: Speech The Dislike Is Not ‘Speech’ — It’s ‘Violence’ The subsequent developments are relatively well known: Robert F. Kennedy Jr., speaking at a large climate-change march in New York, called for the imprisonment of those holding impermissible views on global warming and those who with their financial resources support and spread such views. New York attorney general Eric T. Schneiderman opened a case against Exxon, and the attorneys general of Massachusetts and the U.S. Virgin Islands announced their intended participation in this inquisition. (Al Gore was present at the announcement.) Schneiderman’s prosecution, in the words of the New York Times, would focus on “the company’s funding, for at least a decade, of outside groups that worked to dispute climate science.” This is straight from Professor Torcello. The goal of course is to bully institutions, corporations, and particularly donors and the nonprofits sustained by them. Torcello: “The charge of criminal and moral negligence ought to extend to all activities of the climate deniers who receive funding as part of a sustained campaign to undermine the public’s understanding of scientific consensus.” Kamala Harris, the California attorney general who is seeking a Senate seat, announced an identical investigation of her own. The Obama administration has referred the federal question to the FBI for possible prosecution; currently, progressive strategists are pushing for prosecution under the RICO law, a racketeering statute used to prosecute sprawling organized-crime syndicates. SHARE ARTICLE ON FACEBOOKSHARE TWEET ARTICLETWEET“The First Amendment,” Schneiderman proclaimed, “does not give you the right to commit fraud.” Which is of course true. It is also true that the invocation of “fraud” in this instance is something very close to fraudulent. But once the censors work up a head of steam, it is difficult to stop them. This week, Senator Elizabeth Warren bemoaned the fact that businessmen have “become accustomed to saying whatever they want about Washington policy debates,” and she is pressuring the Securities and Exchange Commission to file fraud charges against businesses that lobby against regulations that they believe would hurt them. Senator Warren charges that the businesses in question exaggerate the costs of regulations when lobbying against them in public and do not do so when communicating with investors and shareholders — which is to say, she wants to make a felony out of what amounts to at most hyperbole or political spin.

**Campuses are restricting climate denial—Colorado proves.**

**Williams 16**  
Thomas D. Williams, PhD, "University of Colorado Bans Free Inquiry of Students Questioning Global Warming" 9-6-16 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/09/06/university-colorado-bans-free-inquiry-students-questioning-global-warming/> ~Premier~

Last week, three professors co-teaching a course titled “Medical Humanities in the Digital Age” emailed a statement to all students informing them that anthropogenic climate change is not up for debate in their course. “We will not, at any time, debate the science of climate change, nor will the ‘other side’ of the climate change debate be taught or discussed in this course,” the professors said in their [letter](http://www.thecollegefix.com/post/28825/) obtained by The College Fix. Regarding those inquisitive students who would like to discuss the issue rather than blindly accepting the global warming dogma, the professors “respectfully ask that you do not take this course.” “The point of departure for this course is based on the scientific premise that human induced climate change is valid and occurring,” the letters states. The letter, signed by course instructors Rebecca Laroche, Wendy Haggren and Eileen Skahill, was sent in response to concerns expressed by several students after watching the first online lecture about the impacts of climate change. The professors, backed by University Communications Director Tom Hutton, said that the ban on debate even extends to discussion among students in the online forums. Students are also forbidden from using outside sources for research in the course, and may only reference materials that have been approved by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The decision by the University of Colorado to eliminate free inquiry came hard on the heels of the University of [Chicago](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/08/27/university-chicago-rebels-pc-thought-police/)’s contrary decision to encourage debate and discussion, even on unpopular subjects. In an August letter to incoming freshmen, Chicago’s Dean of Students Jay Ellison reiterated the University’s “commitment to freedom of inquiry and expression” against the restrictive political correctness codes in force on many U.S. college campuses. Countering the trend toward less freedom of expression in higher education, Chicago [stated](https://twitter.com/ChicagoMaroon/status/768561465183862785/photo/1?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw) that its commitment to academic freedom “means that we do not support so-called ‘trigger warnings,’ we do not cancel invited speakers because their topics might prove controversial, and we do not condone the creation of intellectual ‘safe spaces’ where individuals can retreat from ideas and perspectives at odds with their own.” In other words, if you are afraid of others disagreeing with you or challenging your ideas, then Chicago is not for you. “You will find that we expect members of our community to be engaged in rigorous debate, discussion, and even disagreement. At times this may challenge you and even cause discomfort,” the letter warned. In an earlier [report](http://mag.uchicago.edu/university-news/opening-inquiry) on freedom of expression, University officials cited former Chicago President Hanna Holborn Gray, who observed that “education should not be intended to make people comfortable, it is meant to make them think.” “Universities should be expected to provide the conditions within which hard thought, and therefore strong disagreement, independent judgment, and the questioning of stubborn assumptions, can flourish in an environment of the greatest freedom,” the report stated. The University of Chicago’s decision garnered [plaudits](http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-university-of-chicago-safe-spaces-letter-met-20160825-story.html) from First Amendment advocates. “Free speech is at risk at the very institution where it should be assured: the university,” University of Chicago president Robert Zimmer said. The university is preparing students for the real world and would not be serving them by shielding them from unpleasantness, said Geoffrey Stone, chair of the committee, law professor and past provost at the U. of C. “The right thing to do is empower the students, help them understand how to fight, combat and respond, not to insulate them from things they will have to face later,” Stone said. Last May, DePaul University cancelled a speech by Breitbart’s Milo Yiannopoulos after protests broke out on campus. When Yiannopoulos tried to reschedule, DePaul declared that he was [banned](http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/07/depaul-university-bans-milo-from-returning/) from the University.

**Climate skepticism is set to decline despite Trump but greater public skepticism means less political action—Trump cabinet means brink is now.**

**Foran '16** (CLARE FORAN is an associate editor at The Atlantic. "Donald Trump and the Triumph of Climate-Change Denial," The Atlantic, 12/25, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/12/donald-trump-climate-change-skeptic-denial/510359/)> RW

The more voters are skeptical of man-made climate change, the easier it may be for politicians to justify inaction. It’s impossible to predict what Trump will do in office, but he already [appears](https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/an-america-first-energy-plan) poised to dismantle President Obama’s agenda to combat climate change. He also seems willing to fill his administration with individuals who have cast doubt on the scientific consensus. Trump wants Scott Pruitt, the Oklahoma attorney general, to serve as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Pruitt recently co-[wrote](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/435470/climate-change-attorneys-general) an article claiming that scientists “disagree about the degree and extent of global warming and its connection to the actions of mankind.” Trump’s choice to run the Energy Department, former Texas Governor Rick Perry, has [claimed](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYOQDz9Gt0Q) “the science is not settled” on climate change. And his pick to lead the Interior Department is Republican Representative Ryan Zinke of Montana, who has [reportedly said](http://billingsgazette.com/news/local/government-and-politics/lewis-zinke-debate-federal-budget-health-care-global-warming/article_d062bc3c-c8e9-5909-854f-5e78efc52868.html) that global warming is “not a hoax, but it’s not proven science either.” Despite significant pockets of skepticism and denial, particularly [among conservative Republicans](http://www.eenews.net/assets/2016/04/27/document_cw_01.pdf), there are plenty of Americans across the political spectrum who believe that man-made climate change exists. Gallup [recently found](http://www.gallup.com/poll/190010/concern-global-warming-eight-year-high.aspx) that a majority of Americans believe human activity is causing global warming, and feel worried about the rise in temperatures. Concern over climate change increased among Democrats and Republicans from 2015 to 2016 with 40 percent of Republicans and 84 percent of Democrats reporting concern this year. If that concern continues to increase, skepticism may decline over time among American voters.

**No counter speech specifically in this context—public deliberation over climate denial obscures scientific consensus in favor of artificial controversy—that creates an epistemological gridlock that makes change impossilble**

**Ceccarelli 4-23:** Leah Ceccarelli. April 23rd, 2017. Rhetoric and Public Affairs, Vol. 14, No. 2 (SUMMER 2011), pp. 195-228. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41940538>. Michigan State University Press. RW

A scientific controversy is "manufactured” in the public sphere when an arguer announces that there is an ongoing scientific debate in the technical sphere about a matter for which there is actually an overwhelming scientific consensus., The manufactured scientific controversy can be area as a special type of °public scientific controversy° in which °strategically distorted communication° works to corrode the democratic process. This article will explore the argumentative dynamics of three cases that have been identified by scholars of rhetoric as "manufactured" scientific controversies. In separate case studies that richly detail the specific civic epistemologies involved in cad, rhetoricians have demonstrated how AIDS dissent, global warming skepticism, and intelligent design have been used to manufacture scientific controversy in the public sphere! But no one study has yet detailed the common arguments and coumerarguments deployed in all three cases. Reading these case studies separately, one might conclude that the purpose of the manufactured scientific controversy is to preclude the resolution of an issue in government action, or contrarily, that its purpose is actually to necessitate and legitimize government action.• The comparative study of arguments produced in all three cases will demonstrate how both ends can be served by the tactic; those who manufacture a scientific controversy in the public sphere use the same rhetorical strategies to initiate an "epistemological filibuster" that delays policy change (like the regulation of carbon emissions), or to insert a "fairplay wedge" that enacts policy change (like a state government's introduction of new "teach the controversy" directives for science education).,

#### Warming magnifies every security threat and causes extinction

**Sharp and Kennedy 14** – (Associate Professor Robert (Bob) A. Sharp is the UAE National Defense College Associate Dean for Academic Programs and College Quality Assurance Advisor. He previously served as Assistant Professor of Strategic Security Studies at the College of International Security Affairs (CISA) in the U.S. National Defense University (NDU), Washington D.C. and then as Associate Professor at the Near East South Asia (NESA) Center for Strategic Studies, collocated with NDU. Most recently at NESA, he focused on security sector reform in Yemen and Lebanon, and also supported regional security engagement events into Afghanistan, Turkey, Egypt, Palestine and Qatar; Edward Kennedy is a renewable energy and climate change specialist who has worked for the World Bank and the Spanish Electric Utility ENDESA on carbon policy and markets; 8/22/14, “Climate Change and Implications for National Security,” International Policy Digest, <http://intpolicydigest.org/2014/08/22/climate-change-implications-national-security/>)

Our planet is 4.5 billion years old. If that whole time was to be reflected on a single one-year calendar then the dinosaurs died off sometime late in the afternoon of December 27th and modern humans emerged 200,000 years ago, or at around lunchtime on December 28th. Therefore, human life on earth is very recent. Sometime on December 28th humans made the first fires – wood fires – neutral in the carbon balance. Now reflect on those most recent 200,000 years again on a single one-year calendar and you might be surprised to learn that the industrial revolution began only a few hours ago during the middle of the afternoon on December 31st, 250 years ago, coinciding with the discovery of underground carbon fuels. Over the 250 years carbon fuels have enabled tremendous technological advances including a population growth from about 800 million then to 7.5 billion today and the consequent demand to extract even more carbon. This has occurred during a handful of generations, which is hardly noticeable on our imaginary one-year calendar. The release of this carbon – however – is changing our climate at such a rapid rate that it threatens our survival and presence on earth. It defies imagination that so much damage has been done in such a relatively short time. The implications of climate change is the single most significant threat to life on earth and, put simply, we are not doing enough to rectify the damage. This relatively very recent ability to change our climate is an inconvenient truth; the science is sound. We know of the complex set of interrelated national and global security risks that are a result of global warming and the velocity at which climate change is occurring. We worry it may already be too late. Climate change writ large has informed few, interested some, confused many, and polarized politics. It has already led to an increase in natural disasters including but not limited to droughts, storms, floods, fires etc. The year 2012 was among the 10 warmest years on record according to an American Meteorological Society (AMS) report. Research suggests that climate change is already affecting human displacement; reportedly 36 million people were displaced in 2008 alone because of sudden natural disasters. Figures for 2010 and 2011 paint a grimmer picture of people displaced because of rising sea levels, heat and storms. Climate change affects all natural systems. It impacts temperature and consequently it affects water and weather patterns. It contributes to desertification, deforestation and acidification of the oceans. Changes in weather patterns may mean droughts in one area and floods in another. Counter-intuitively, perhaps, sea levels rise but perennial river water supplies are reduced because glaciers are retreating. As glaciers and polar ice caps melt, there is an albedo effect, which is a double whammy of less temperature regulation because of less surface area of ice present. This means that less absorption occurs and also there is less reflection of the sun’s light. A potentially critical wild card could be runaway climate change due to the release of methane from melting tundra. Worldwide permafrost soils contain about 1,700 Giga Tons of carbon, which is about four times more than all the carbon released through human activity thus far. The planet has already adapted itself to dramatic climate change including a wide range of distinct geologic periods and multiple extinctions, and at a pace that it can be managed. It is human intervention that has accelerated the pace dramatically: An increased surface temperature, coupled with more severe weather and changes in water distribution will create uneven threats to our agricultural systems and will foster and support the spread of insect borne diseases like Malaria, Dengue and the West Nile virus. Rising sea levels will increasingly threaten our coastal population and infrastructure centers and with more than 3.5 billion people – half the planet – depending on the ocean for their primary source of food, ocean acidification may dangerously undercut critical natural food systems which would result in reduced rations. Climate change also carries significant inertia. Even if emissions were completely halted today, temperature increases would continue for some time. Thus the impact is not only to the environment, water, coastal homes, agriculture and fisheries as mentioned, but also would lead to conflict and thus impact national security. Resource wars are inevitable as countries respond, adapt and compete for the shrinking set of those available resources. These wars have arguably already started and will continue in the future because climate change will force countries to act for national survival; the so-called Climate Wars. As early as 2003 Greenpeace alluded to a report which it claimed was commissioned by the Pentagon titled: An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for U.S. National Security. It painted a picture of a world in turmoil because global warming had accelerated. The scenario outlined was both abrupt and alarming. The report offered recommendations but backed away from declaring climate change an immediate problem, concluding that it would actually be more incremental and measured; as such it would be an irritant, not a shock for national security systems. In 2006 the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) – Institute of Public Research – convened a board of 11 senior retired generals and admirals to assess National Security and the Threat to Climate Change. Their initial report was published in April 2007 and made no mention of the potential acceleration of climate change. The team found that climate change was a serious threat to national security and that it was: “most likely to happen in regions of the world that are already fertile ground for extremism.” The team made recommendations from their analysis of regional impacts which suggested the following. Europe would experience some fracturing because of border migration. Africa would need more stability and humanitarian operations provided by the United States. The Middle East would experience a “loss of food and water security (which) will increase pressure to emigrate across borders.” Asia would suffer from “threats to water and the spread of infectious disease. ” In 2009 the CIA opened a Center on Climate Change and National Security to coordinate across the intelligence community and to focus policy. In May 2014, CNA again convened a Military Advisory Board but this time to assess National Security and the Accelerating Risk of Climate Change. The report concludes that climate change is no longer a future threat but occurring right now and the authors appeal to the security community, the entire government and the American people to not only build resilience against projected climate change impacts but to form agreements to stabilize climate change and also to integrate climate change across all strategy and planning. The calm of the 2007 report is replaced by a tone of anxiety concerning the future coupled with calls for public discourse and debate because “time and tide wait for no man.” The report notes a key distinction between resilience (mitigating the impact of climate change) and agreements (ways to stabilize climate change) and states that: Actions by the United States and the international community have been insufficient to adapt to the challenges associated with projected climate change. Strengthening resilience to climate impacts already locked into the system is critical, but this will reduce long-term risk only if improvements in resilience are accompanied by actionable agreements on ways to stabilize climate change. The 9/11 Report framed the terrorist attacks as less of a failure of intelligence than a failure of imagination. Greenpeace’s 2003 account of the Pentagon’s alleged report describes a coming climate Armageddon which to readers was unimaginable and hence the report was not really taken seriously. It described: A world thrown into turmoil by drought, floods, typhoons. Whole countries rendered uninhabitable. The capital of the Netherlands submerged. The borders of the U.S. and Australia patrolled by armies firing into waves of starving boat people desperate to find a new home. Fishing boats armed with cannon to drive off competitors. Demands for access to water and farmland backed up with nuclear weapons. The CNA and Greenpeace/Pentagon reports are both mirrored by similar analysis by the World Bank which highlighted not only the physical manifestations of climate change, but also the significant human impacts that threaten to unravel decades of economic development, which will ultimately foster conflict. Climate change is the quintessential “Tragedy of the Commons,” where the cumulative impact of many individual actions (carbon emission in this case) is not seen as linked to the marginal gains available to each individual action and not seen as cause and effect. It is simultaneously huge, yet amorphous and nearly invisible from day to day. It is occurring very fast in geologic time terms, but in human time it is (was) slow and incremental. Among environmental problems, it is uniquely global. With our planet and culture figuratively and literally honeycombed with a reliance on fossil fuels, we face systemic challenges in changing the reliance across multiple layers of consumption, investment patterns, and political decisions; it will be hard to fix!

**Magnitude first—we have to account for future generations**

**Matheny 07** – (Jason, Department of Health Policy and Management, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, “Reducing the Risk of Human Extinction,” Risk Analysis, Vol 27, No 5)

We may be poorly equipped to recognize or plan for extinction risks (Yudkowsky, 2007). We may not be good at grasping the significance of very large numbers (catastrophic outcomes) or very small numbers (probabilities) over large timeframes. We struggle with estimating the probabilities of rare or unprecedented events (Kunreuther et al., 2001).Policymakers may not plan far beyond current political administrations and rarely do risk assessments value the existence of future generations.18 We may unjustifiably discount the value of future lives. Finally, extinction risks are market failures where an individual enjoys no perceptible benefit from his or her investment in risk reduction. Human survival may thus be a good requiring deliberate policies to protect. It might be feared that consideration of extinction risks would lead to a reductio ad absurdum: we ought to invest all our resources in asteroid defense or nuclear disarmament, instead of AIDS, pollution, world hunger, or other problems we face today. On the contrary, programs that create a healthy and content global population are likely to reduce the probability of global war or catastrophic terrorism. They should thus be seen as an essential part of a portfolio of risk-reducing projects. Discussing the risks of “nuclear winter,” Carl Sagan (1983) wrote: Some have argued that the difference between the deaths of several hundred million people in a nuclear war (as has been thought until recently to be a reasonable upper limit) and the death of every person on Earth (as now seems possible) is only a matter of one order of magnitude. For me, the difference is considerably greater. Restricting our attention only to those who dieas a consequence of the war conceals its full impact. If we are required to calibrate extinction in numerical terms, I would be sure to include the number of people in future generations who would not be born. A nuclear war imperils all of our descendants, for as long as there will be humans. Even if the population remains static, with an average lifetime of the order of 100 years, over a typical time period for the biological evolution of a successful species (roughly ten million years), we are talking about some 500 trillion people yet to come. By this criterion, the stakes are one million times greater for extinction than for the more modest nuclear wars that kill “only” hundreds of millions of people. There are many other possible measures ofthe potential loss—including culture and science, the evolutionary history of the planet, and the significance of the lives of all of our ancestors who contributed to the future of their descendants. Extinction is the undoing of the human enterprise. In a similar vein, the philosopher Derek Parfit (1984) wrote: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: 1. Peace 2. A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population 3. A nuclear war that kills 100% 2 would be worse than 1, and 3 would be worse than 2. Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between 1 and 2. I believe that the difference between 2 and 3 is very much greater . . . . The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between 2 and 3 may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second. Human extinction in the next few centuries could reduce the number of future generations by thousands or more. We take extraordinary measures to protect some endangered species from extinction. It might be reasonable to take extraordinary measures to protect humanity from the same.19 To decide whether this is so requires more discussion of the methodological problems mentioned here, as well as research on the extinction risks we face and the costs of mitigating them.20

**Moral uncertainty means extinction comes first**

**Bostrom 13:** Nick Bostrom (Faculty of Philosophy at Oxford). “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy, Vol. 4, Issue 1. 2013. http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html

These reflections on **moral uncertainty** suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a **great option value** in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this we must prevent any existential catastrophe.